

6-24-2011

Race, Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Age of Migrations

Kate Dougherty

The University of Western Ontario

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/totem>



Part of the [Archaeological Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dougherty, Kate (2001) "Race, Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Age of Migrations," *Totem: The University of Western Ontario Journal of Anthropology*: Vol. 9: Iss. 1, Article 4.

Available at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/totem/vol9/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Totem: The University of Western Ontario Journal of Anthropology by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact kmarshal@uwo.ca.

Race, Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Age of Migrations

Keywords

Germany, Age of Migrations, skeletal material, Altenerding, Middle Ages, race, ethnicity

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).

Race, Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Age of Migrations

Kate Dougherty

INTRODUCTION

Important foundations in many individuals' lives are the concepts of who we are, where we come from, and how long we have been in a place. In some cases, these concepts are incorporated into nationalistic identities, that may in fact be created to further not only personal, but political agendas.

One such region with questions about 'the self' is modern Germany. During the time romantically termed by European historians as the Age of Migrations, (in Germany the *Volkerwanderung* – 'People Migration Time'), a vast region including what is now modern Germany was populated by successive waves of immigrants originating from different regions. There are great debates over when this region was settled and who exactly settled there. The predominant idea proposed by most early historians is that of a Scandinavian origin of the German peoples.

An earlier study into this issue consisted of an artifact attribute analysis correlated with biological traits of skeletons at the site of Altenerding. Altenerding (Old Erding) is the site of an early middle age cemetery located in Bavaria that was discovered by accident in the summer of 1965. Artifacts, along with burials, were uncovered during the construction of a new housing subdivision (Sage 1975:254). During the first three weeks of excavation, fifty burials were found. Based on the grave goods recovered, the cemetery was dated to about A.D. 550. During the course of four seasons

of excavations it became apparent that the site was one of the largest archaeological sites in Bavarian prehistory (Sage 1975:254) and indeed one of the most important (Sage 1984:11).

During the course of my study it was discovered that at least two morphologically distinct populations were present in the sample. These populations were distinguishable from physical traits recorded from the skeletons (Dougherty, 2000). This finding made me very interested in the idea of nationality, ethnicity and population origins, as my results seemed to contradict the historians' view of a single place of origin. This paper will examine the concepts of ethnicity and race and how they apply to the creation of national identity in Germany. To operationalise my definitions for the purpose of this paper, ethnicity will relate to the cultural geography of peoples, and directly relates to artifacts and economic relationships that can be derived from an archaeological analysis. Race will refer in this case to a biological grouping of populations in the sense of population differentiation by physical traits of the skeleton. These physical differences imply different geographical origins and biological affinity, and will be inferred using physical anthropological techniques. In the discipline of physical anthropology, a recent statement was that 'biological races do not exist'. Skeletal traits and/or gene frequencies seen previously being immutable determinants of an individual's race now are known to be affected by many factors such as the environment. I define a "race" as a vast group of people loosely bound

together by historically contingent, socially significant elements of their morphology and/or ancestry. In using this type of analysis, we are looking at biological affinity – a relative term, where certain traits are seen as more like each other in comparison to others.

For my case study, I will be using the Altenerding material, plus various ethnographies contemporary to the time period in order to look at the creation of the German nationalistic identity/ethnicity and how it relates to the physical data.

Background

The region of what is now modern Bavaria and indeed modern Germany itself has been the centre of many different occupations. It is believed that in the late Bronze Age (c. 500 B.C.) Germanic speaking peoples inhabited southern Sweden, the Danish peninsula, and northern Germany. At that time Celts inhabited most of the territory that is now occupied by the German people. By the end of the 2nd century B.C., however, Germanic tribes had advanced into southern and central Germany, displacing the Celts and

coming into contact with the Romans in Gaul.

Solid historical information about the Germans begins with Julius Caesar's campaigns in Gaul between 58 and 50 B.C. Around the year 58 B.C., an emigration of the Helvetier from what is now South West Germany was described by Caesar. It is believed that this mass emigration possibly hid another migration of people, which covered a substantially larger region in what are now Central Germany and the Czech Republic. In ancient Thuringia (a region corresponding to modern east-central Germany), Bohemia and Northern Bavaria, there is evidence for an influx of Teutons in Eastern South Bavaria encountering a Celtic subpopulation from the Thuringer Basin (Keller, 1985:28). The Romans inhabited the edge of modern Western South Bavaria at this time and Celtic remainders inhabited the nearby region of the Alps. The Germanic tribes were established west of the Rhine River and had reached the Danube River in the south. After Caesar's defeat of the Suevi, the Germans were confined to the region east of the Rhine.

Figure 1. Region around Altenerding (modern)

In what is now the eastern portion of modern South Bavaria, a few graves and settlements have been found to date to the time of 16/15 B.C. (Keller, 1985). However, in the west and alpine zones of Upper Bavaria, there are only a small number of single finds. It is possible, however, that the region was only sparsely populated at the time, which would explain the scarcity of sites and artifacts.

Between 12 and 9 B.C. the Romans penetrated as far east as the Elbe River, but the victory of the German leader Arminius over a Roman army in the Battle of the Teutoburg Forest in A.D. 9 halted Roman colonial expansion in north-central Europe and freed the greater part of Germany from Roman domination (Hubert, 1969).

In A.D. 233, the collapse of the Roman civilisation took place in Northern Raetia (which is an ancient Roman province comprising Vorarlberg and Tyrol states in present-day Austria). The release of the borderland north of the Danube may have taken place around A.D. 260. The victory altar of Augsburg shows the Germanic region has been struck from Roman federations along with Augsburg (Rieder 1995:213) implying that the Romans no longer had control of the region.

It is likely that under the Emperor Diocletian (ruled A.D. 284-305) the Danube boundary was again created. On the border road there is evidence for castellet systems, which resemble mediaeval castles in structure. They were strung out in irregular distances, between which were smaller outposts manned by smaller crews (Scorpan 1980:105). There is a late Roman castellet on the Neuberger city mountain, and east of it is a well-known fortification in the Brucker forest. The grave field of the Neuburger castellet shows that the crew manning the fortification consisted almost exclusively of Germanic mercenaries and their attendants

(Scorpan 1980:3).

About A.D. 370, nomadic Hunnic horsemen began to move westward (see figure 2), driving the Germanic peoples into the Roman Empire in several waves that continued into the 5th century. Around A.D. 400, historical sources document a recall of Raetian troops by the Roman army commander Stilicho to Italy. Following this transfer of power, north of the Danube a new subpopulation appears and a number of independent Germanic kingdoms appeared. By A.D. 476 their invasions and emigrations had brought the western half of the Roman Empire to an end, and set the stage for the Franks (also known as Franconians) (Randers-Pehrson, 1983).

The Franks were one of the principal Germanic peoples at this time. In the late 5th century the Merovingian king Clovis established a Frankish kingdom in Gaul and western Germany and accepted Christianity. For some reason, perhaps climactic changes as suggested by Goffart, Germanic Celtic tribes began to migrate through the decline of the Roman Empire, settling around A.D. 600 (Goffart 1998). The details of this migration of tribes and their settlement are unclear. Reliable historical sources are scarce and there is scant archaeological evidence (Sage 1970).

This population seems to have originated from the south and west of the area of Bohemia (now modern Czech Republic) mentioned earlier and advanced into the territory north of the Danube. These people are linguistically linked with the Bohemians ('*Baiuwarrii*'), as the modern name the region they settled is Bavaria ('*Bayern*') (Sage 1970).

The new population respected the Roman realm boundary, the Danube. Typical ceramics belonging to these people are only found in the castellet workstations, such as in Eining, Regensburg and Straubing. This type of ceramics is also linked to a grave field

close to the locality of Friedenhain, north of Straubing. This suggests that the young men in the Roman border troops interacted with the local population, of which earlier incidents are documented in previous populations. This practice seems to have gone on for no longer than a generation (Scorpan 1980:3).

Several reasons for the movement have been proposed. Stubbs (1969:8) proposes that the migration could have been incited by variously (a) the choosing of permanent settlement sites by pastoral tribes, (b) invasions by warlike tribes, or, (c) constant influx of distant tribes towards Roman Empire, taking up unprotected border lands left by conquered tribes.

Figure 2. Some of the main movements in the Age of Migrations. Note that in this map, the area denoted as Franks/Frankish Kingdom comprises several groups such as the Lombards, Marcomanni, Alemanni etc.

These various hypotheses imply a complex migration pattern of the Germanic tribes that obscures the origin of Bavarians. The identification of their geographical and ethnic roots is difficult and controversial (Schmidt 1940:194). As described above the

Germanic/Celtic tribes that moved in seem to have originated from south and west of Bohemia. It is documented that the Marcomanni drove the Gallic tribe of the *Boii* from Bohemia ('*Boiarii/Baiuwarri*') then forced them west and south (Stubbs 1969:11). This reinforces the linguistic link mentioned above between the two regions. Other tribes known to be in the area at the time (see Figure 2) were the Ostrogoths, Visgoths, Franconians (Frankish), Alemanni, Thuringians, Suevi, and the Lombards (Goffart 1998; Sage 1970).

As for the time of the settlement of the region, the popular view is that there was no settlement in the fifth century (Sage 1970:45). The area was a "no man's land", a corridor through which tribes migrated from the north to the south. Around the sixth century, the migrating Bavarians ('*Boiarii/Baiuwarri*') settled in the area (Sage 1970:45).

This view is somewhat problematic and disregards current archaeological evidence, which seems to indicate that splinter groups from Germanic tribes settled in Raetia as early as the fourth century (Sage 1970:45). This evidence is represented by a change in the artifact assemblage over time. These changes in the assemblage are likely due to the influx of new ideas and traditions from different tribes.

Ethnicity vs. Race

Ethnic identity according to Jones (1997) is the aspect of a person's self conceptualisation which results from identification with a broader group in opposition to others on the basis of perceived cultural differentiation and/or common descent. So then, following her reasoning, an ethnic group is any group of people who set themselves apart and/or are set apart by others with whom they interact or co-exist on the basis of their perceptions of cultural differentiation and/or common descent. These definitions pose a distinct problem when we enter the realm of archaeological populations.

These previous definitions require a self-identification on the part of the group. Since archaeologists deal with the material remains of a culture, there can be no direct interrogation of the group to see if they truly thought of themselves as part of an ethnic group.

Ethnicity can be seen as 'a collection of rather simplistic and obvious statements about boundaries, otherness, goals and achievements, being and identity, descent and classification, that has been constructed as much by the anthropologist as the subject' (Wade 1997:16). I feel that this idea more closely matches how archaeologists approach the idea of ethnicity.

However, when stepping over into the realm of physical anthropology, the application of these ideas must change. Wade (1997) makes a very cogent observation that the above ideas proposed could be applied to the idea of race, being that the core to these concepts is the identification of sameness and difference. I do feel that in a sense race is socially constructed as much as ethnic identity, and as he states, racial identifications are similar to ethnic identifications as both are partial, unstable, contextual and fragmentary (1997:20). Race must be understood as *a social phenomenon* in which contested systems of meaning serve as the connections between *physical features, races, and personal characteristics*. Race is neither an essence nor an illusion, but rather an ongoing, contradictory, self-reinforcing process subject to the macro forces of social and political struggle and the micro effects of daily decisions.

This debate over race and ethnicity directly applies to the time of the Age of Migrations. It is necessary to examine some of the words used by both modern historians and ancient historians; words such as 'peoples', 'nations', 'tribes' and 'races'. It is also necessary to look at the concepts behind these words as how they are used, both in the usage

contemporary to the time period and in modern anthropological and historical vernacular. Nation is a difficult word, because it carried connotations that nations are natural, given units that divide human beings. In most historical analyses, it is assumed that the 'nation-states' of today form the basic stock of nations. The problem arises when one tries to determine who fits into the nation. Definitions by ethnicity do not help. The concept of ethnicity has developed only in the late twentieth century and carries its own anachronistic connotations (Wade 1997; Chapman 1993). It sometimes seems to cover the possession of both a common culture and a common descent, but sometimes only relates to the former (Smith 1986).

Until the late nineteenth century, no one seems to have felt the need to distinguish between what we would now identify as physically inherited characteristics (race) and cultural characteristics (ethnicity). It was assumed that these went together. To some extent, this is probably true. People living together tend to speak the same language, intermarry, and if isolated geographically, will tend to develop different phenotypic appearances. So, cultural groups can in some cases correspond to a biological population (or 'race'). However, if one looks at the historical sources from the period, it is evident that there are a lot of different labels being applied to the 'barbarians' in the region. These names appear and disappear in the records, indicating that there was a great deal of mixing and movement going on (Reynolds 1998). It is known (see above) that barbarians who served in Roman armies or were in war bands intermixed with women from other groups. Culturally, barbarians may have been indistinguishable from the Romans, and similar enough to one another for individuals or small groups to be assimilated.

The discovery of Tacitus' *Germania* in the fifteenth century spurred new interest in Ancient Germans and the differences between

Roman and Germanic culture. This developed the interest in tracing origins of the German people, with the connotation of a noble origin from the north (Reynolds 1998).

Ethnicity in German Archaeology

Since 1945, West German archaeologists have shunned cross-cultural comparison and "ethnographic parallels". This happened partly because of their biased use in Nazi and nationalistic archaeology. There was a kind of retreat after the Nazi regime into something approaching antiquarianism. As a consequence of this retreat, German protohistoric archaeology began to pull out of step with Anglo-American developments (Harke 2000).

From the later 1960s onwards, German archaeologists seem to disengage themselves from the international exchange of ideas, and

despite the difficulty, the purely archaeological approach is still often used for the determination of families and kin groups (e.g. Kersting 1992).

As an example, material from Altenerding was examined using the archaeological techniques briefly outlined above. The material type of the artifacts did not seem to play any role in the patterning. Certain material types were not any more likely to be found in conjunction with a biological trait than any other, however they do indicate social status, as items have the same style and function but are made from differing materials.

The first example of artifact patterning based on a biological trait was in artifact

did not involve themselves in processual and post processual debates (Harke 1991, 1995).

One of the most current themes in German archaeology is the search for families and kin groups in cemeteries, and by extension, the determination of ethnic groups. One archaeologist by the name of Koch (1990:243-247), attempted to distinguish between family members and a *comitatus* (personal war band) of an aristocratic household in a cemetery at Klepstrau. She noted that this was a very difficult undertaking on the basis of archaeological data alone (location of artifacts, spatial patterning within cemetery, type of artifacts, horizontal stratigraphy of the plots). However,

distribution by sex. Strictly speaking, this was not the focus of this study, which was concerned with looking for cultural traits outside of gender that influence artifact distribution. It was necessary though to get an idea of the patterning by sex in order to see if the other patterns noticed were as a result of sex, or something new unto themselves.

Artifacts were taken and totaled by presence/absence by sex. In this straight comparison, it was apparent that many of the same types of artifacts appear with both sexes. The first explanation for this is that some items are functional such as knives, belt fittings, and combs. Both males and females would have used knives, have used belts in their clothing and used combs for their hair.

Table 1. Artifact Distribution by Sex

Sex	Males
Female	Beads, fibulae, ring, pendant, bracelet, spindlewhorl, drawknife, earring
Male	Sax, fastening, flint, tweezer, awl, arrowhead, spear, shield, sword, whetstone
Both	Knife, fitting, belt fitting, needle, comb

Now that a baseline of "male" and "female" type artifacts has been determined, the types of artifacts can be examined. Type is defined

here as the kind of object, defined by its function. The type does not encompass style, which are specific design elements or

attributes that distinguish individual makers or the cultural origins of the artifacts.

The analysis of type as applied to the Altenerding material does not really give any meaningful results, because these same types of artifacts are found over a very large geographical region. In fact, Anglo-Saxon artifacts recovered at such sites in England as Winterbourne Gunner and Finglesham (Musty and Stratton 1964; Chadwick 1958) have identical types as the Altenerding material, even though skeletal analysis shows that they were biologically a different population, and they were separated geographically.

Therefore, it is necessary to examine the style of the artifact. Style can be more important than type in an analysis because type can be influenced by function. Early artifacts from the site show influence from Central Germany and Bohemia. West Germanic artifact styles (Frankonians and Alemanni) are initially not represented in large quantities, however they predominate after the middle of sixth century AD (Sage 1970:46). This data bolsters the theory that the region was settled by multiple splinter groups, and does not seem to indicate a northern origin for these peoples in Southern Germany. It is possible that these stylistically distinct artifacts came in through trade networks rather than with people, however, detailed analysis of the archaeological material indicates that these artifacts were brought in with people (Sage 1970:50).

The basis of ethnic identification in German archaeology has increasingly been shifted from artifacts in graves to mortuary ritual. Examples of this are the attempts to work out the ethnic composition of populations in early mediaeval trading towns from the frequencies of supposedly diagnostic disposal types and grave constructions in the adjoining cemeteries (Steuer 1984; Jons *et al.* 1994:208-214). This approach is based on the assumption that ritual is more conservative, and therefore more diagnostic than artifact

styles. However, this assumption has yet to be subjected to methodological scrutiny. Another approach advocated by Siegmund (1999, 2000) is the use of whole cemeteries as units of analysis. This approach starts with the assumption that the ethnic affiliation of individual graves is difficult, if not impossible to determine because of their diversity. Siegmund argues that by summarising the individual data such as frequencies of artifact types, orientation of inhumations, and frequency of cremations into an "average" burial rite, the result is a more accurate "cultural model" that will lead to the identification of the ethnic affiliation of the population.

As an application of his theory, he mapped the "cultural models" of over 200 cemeteries of the 6th century A.D. in western and northern Germany. His results show two homogeneous areas in the west and south which he equates with documented settlement areas of the Franks and Alemanni respectively (Siegmund 2000), and a heterogeneous area in the north which is situated where written sources place the Saxons (See Figure 2). The fact that this northern region is heterogeneous led him to doubt that the Saxons were a homogeneous ethnic group (Siegmund 1999).

Race in Physical Anthropology

When looking at what has been termed 'race', physical anthropologists have been trying to come up with biological characteristics that enable them to differentiate populations. The concept as applied by physical anthropologists does not imply that these differentiated groups are static and fixed, but tries to ascertain physical geographical origins of people in a way similar to how archaeology tries to interpret the cultural geography of a people.

In the osteological observation of the Altenerding population, the general size and robustness of skeletons was remarked upon in

detail (Helmuth, n.d.). About one-sixth of the population did not show the typical robust type found in most Bavarian South Germany sites. This robust type is described as *Reihengraebertypus* (literally Rhine Grave Type). The smaller group is quite different from the *Reihengraebertypus*. They are a gracile, undescribed and undocumented Mediterranean type (Sage 1970:44). They include typical Mediterranean cranial traits

such as a particular development of the fronto-nasal region (Sage 1975:270). These cranial traits could be applied to the Altenerding skeletal population,

differentiating them into two main groups by *form nasalia* (shape of the nose) and *nasenrucken* (shape of the back of the nose).

Table 2. Distribution of Form Nasalia in percent

Sex	n	ght	Strai	Cave	Con	Intermed./Incomp
A 1 1	355		25%		37%	6%
skeletons						
Males	140		8%		20%	11%
Female	165		16%		13%	19%
s						52%

Table 2 shows the distribution of *form nasalia* for the skeletal population. The distribution across all individuals was relatively even. When the distribution was examined by sex, the largest concentration of

females has a convex shape. Males have the largest concentration of concave. These results do follow a normal distribution over the whole population.

Table 3. Distribution of Nasenrucken in percent

Sex	n	High	Med	Low	Intermed./Incomp
A 1 1	480		20%		40%
skeletons					
Males	427	4%	5%	33%	58%
Female	226	28%	14%	33%	25%
s					

Table 3 shows the frequency of distribution for the second characteristic, *nasenrucken*. Similar to *form nasalia*, there are also three main morphological types represented, with some outliers falling in intermediate categories. The overall distribution is interesting because the high and low forms are very close in frequency of appearance and are separated distinctly from the remaining form. The results for females follow the same trend as the *form nasalia* trait which is to have the greatest number of low

types, followed by a slightly smaller sample of high types and then a markedly smaller number of medium types. However, the male results show a marked concentration of the largest number of individuals in the low type. The patterning of these *nasenrucken* types shows two very different profiles between the male and female individuals.

It is important to note that a much larger sample size was preserved for the males. This is most likely due to the general robustness of the skull in males which

increases the chances of preservation.

There is an almost equal number of male and female skeletons in the cemetery. Approximately 35% are male and 40% are female. The remaining 25% could not be accurately assessed. The undetermined individuals, for the purpose of this study, consist of both those that could not be assessed as well as those who were assigned an archaeological sex based on the artifacts discovered with them.

Body height was examined in order to determine if this trait correlated with the

nasenrucken and *form nasalia* findings. Again, there is evidence for at least two morphologically distinct populations. If there are two populations present (one robust and tall, and one more gracile and short) that can be distinguished by certain nasal characteristics, the examination of body height would prove useful in distinguishing them. There is clear evidence for sexual dimorphism, as the mean heights of the males and females were nearly 11cm apart.

Table 4. Body Heights (in cm) and Cranial Traits

Sex	High	Medium	Low	Straight	Concave	Convex
Males	171.08	174.11	<u>174.95</u>	174.36	163.79	<u>175.09</u>
Females	162.26	162.75	<u>163.00</u>	161.75	<u>167.09</u>	163.17

The body heights of the main *nasenrucken* and *form nasalia* types were examined, as this could indicate different geographical origins of the individuals. Table 4 demonstrates the distributions. The body heights obtained when examining *nasenrucken* are quite close to each other. However, the same individuals when grouped by *form nasalia* show a wider spread of average body heights between the different types.

The body heights obtained from the *nasenrucken* data produce results showing the low and medium types have very close body heights (however there is a substantially higher number of low individuals than medium), followed by a shorter body height for the high type. When examining the same individuals grouped by *form nasalia*, the body heights are fairly close together (Dougherty, 2000).

The results obtained from the *form nasalia* data seem to show a higher mean body height in general than the results obtained from the population as discriminated by *nasenrucken*. The high *nasenrucken* type displays the shortest mean body height for

both sexes. This correlates with the hypothesis that the high *nasenrucken* type individuals are the Mediterranean type noted earlier. Conversely, the tallest forms for both sexes are the low or medium types, which could indicate that they are the robust *Reihengrabertypus* individuals.

The craniometric data from Altenerding was taken and discriminant function analyses on this population were performed as compared to the Anglo-Saxon populations of Winterbourne Gunner (Musty and Stratton 1964; Chadwick 1968). The results indicated that these populations were geographically distinct, and that there were no metric similarities. It would have been useful to examine craniofacial data to see if the same types of nasal forms existed in that population but unfortunately at the time those sites were excavated, those data were not recorded.

Combining Archaeological and Physical Anthropological Analysis

There is a growing realisation in the discipline that mortuary and ethnic research requires the use of biological data in addition

to artifactual data. This has led to a cooperation between archaeologists and physical anthropologists. One of the most successful methods so far is the analysis of heritability of over 375 dental traits. The rate of heritability is known, and therefore the degree of biological relationship between individuals can be calculated (Alt *et al.* 1994; Alt and Vach 1994, 1995). An example of the application of this technique is at the site of Dattingen, an early Iron Age barrow cemetery. A statistical analysis of the presence and absence of specific characteristic dental traits allowed Alt and Vach to suggest that at least one of the barrows was a family tomb. Also,

females showed a close biological relationship amongst themselves that was not correlated to males, which suggested that they may have practiced exogamy and matrilocality (Alt and Vach 1995).

In combining the results from the osteological and artifactual analysis of the Altenerding material, certain key patterns come to light. This type of analysis gives a base distribution pattern of the artifacts from which the distribution patterns based on the physical characteristics can be compared.

Table 5. Artifact distributions and Craniofacial Characteristics

Sex	Trait	Expression	Artifacts
Male	Nasenrucken	low	Sax, spear, vessel, fastening, sword, shield, firesteel, flint, tweezer, arrowhead, awl, comb, needle, knife, belt fitting, fitting
Female	Nasenrucken	high	Bead, fibula, ring, pendant, bracelet, vessel, spindlewhorl, earring, comb, needle, knife, belt fitting, fitting
Male	Form nasalia	concave	Sax, belt fitting, flint, sword, shield, spear, knife, firesteel, arrowhead, awl, tweezer, vessel, comb, bead
		convex	Tweezers
		straight	Comb, vessel, scale
Female	Form nasalia	concave	Ring, pendant
		convex	Fibula, needle, pendant, vessel, comb, bead
		straight	Fitting, pendant, bead

It is first important to note that the "male" type artifacts such as swords and spears are with individuals sexed as male based on skeletal characteristics. These individuals have low *nasenrucken*. The vast majority of low *nasenrucken* individuals have been sexed as male. Conversely, the vast majority of high *nasenrucken* individuals are female. The artifacts found with the high *nasenrucken* individuals are generally "female", whereas the artifacts found with low *nasenrucken* individuals tend to be "male".

At the beginning it was assumed that the low *nasenrucken* individuals would be the

Reihengrabertypus individuals and the high *nasenrucken* individuals were the gracile Mediterranean type. This correlates with the examination of stature of the various forms. However, this does not make sense with the data here. It seems likely that more high *nasenrucken* females are one morphological type and more males are another. Historical horizon distribution of the *nasenrucken* forms indicates that similar levels of males and females exist at that same time. Up to A.D. 500, the cemetery is sparsely populated. From A.D. 500-600 there is a great increase in population. It is unknown why males tend to have low *nasenrucken* and females tending to

have high ones, however these results could be interpreted in such a way that a male/female differentiation existed. For example, it could be posited that the low *nasenrucken* males (i.e. 'local' Germanic population) were more sedentary and more females (of the Mediterranean/Roman high *nasenrucken* forms) migrated into the area at a time when the Altenerding population increased in the later historical horizon. There are indications from Sage's work (1984) that females were more mobile and migrated into areas where males were more sedentary. Further exploration of this issue may clarify the various migration patterns. A more in-depth examination of this issue (beyond the scope of this paper) will be very interesting and beneficial to the information gathered on this region and period of time.

DISCUSSION

There is a tendency to lump all the barbarian groups together by using the same word, whether 'tribe' or *Stamm* 'ethnic group' or 'people' in order to denote the named collectives found in the historical sources or the archaeological record. If it is right to assume that no human groups above the family are natural in the sense that surviving ideas of 'races', nations and ethnic groups imply, then the word used does not matter (Reynolds 1998). It is misleading however to suggest that after the fall of Rome, these tribes/ethnic groups turned into nations. Some of the names of groups have eventually turned into the names of modern nations, and their territories roughly correspond to modern national boundaries, but that does not automatically grant membership into the new group. Perhaps these names were never used by the groups themselves but imposed by historians or archaeologists (Reynolds 1998). There is little reason to believe that these sixth century and later references to what look like Scandinavian place names or peoples

really had anything to do with the peoples themselves. It may be proposed that leaders would have encouraged solidarity and loyalty by myths of common descent. It is a fact that ideas, traditions and myths can be borrowed and freely passed on or even abandoned.

The idea of 'ethnogenesis' perhaps embodies the concept of the appearance of new societies or polities in Europe. However this term carries the caveat that this Age of Migrations may not have been as long as previously supposed, and it is not the sole period of ethnogenesis in Europe, as there are many examples of this occurring later in the Middle Ages (Hagenmeyer 1913). It is likely that the groups defined in this period are not really characterised by 'real' ethnic or 'racial' identity, but more by political allegiance.

There is evidence for at least two morphologically distinct skeletal populations at Altenerding, Bayern, Germany. The combination of this find with the non-homogeneity of the style of grave artifacts remarked upon earlier means that the hypothesis that there was an uninhabited Bavaria settled by a single tribe can be safely rejected (Sage 1970:46). It is more likely that an influx of various tribes eventually formed the "Bavarian tribe" over a period of time (Sage 1975:274).

Therefore, the study of archaeology and physical anthropology as they apply to ethnicity and race is very important in dealing with these types of situations. As these applied identities can be deconstructed, the emic view of how these people thought of themselves can be approached. Archaeology gives tools for understanding the culture relationships of the people ('ethnicity') and physical anthropology applies tools that enable population movements to be traced and geographical origins to be ascertained ('race'). A synthesis of these two techniques enables anthropologists to explore Wade's (1997) observation that individuals can have both a racial identity (implying ancestral

origin) and an ethnic identity (implying cultural geography) and these two identities can be quite different.

REFERENCES CITED

- Alt, Kurt W. and Werner Vach. 1994. Rekonstruktion biologischer und sozialer Strukturen in ur- und frühgeschichtlichen Bevölkerungen—Innovative Ansätze zur Verwandtschaftsanalyse in der Archäologie. *Praehistorische Zeitschrift* 69:56-91.
- Alt, Kurt W. and Werner Vach. 1995. Odontologic kinship analysis in skeletal remains: Concepts, methods and results. *Forensic Science International* 74:99-113.
- Chadwick, Sonia E. 1958. The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Finglesham, Kent: a Reconsideration, *Mediaeval Archaeology* 2: 1-71
- Chapman, M. 1993. Social and Biological Aspects of Ethnicity. Oxford Press.
- Dougherty, Kathleen M. 2000. *An examination of archaeological artifact patterning in conjunction with biological traits of the Skeletal Population at Altenerding, Germany*. Honours Thesis, Peterborough: Trent University.
- Goffart, Walter. 1998. The Narrators of Barbarian History (AD 550-800): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon. Princeton: University Press.
- Hagenmeyer, H. 1913. *Historia Hierosolymitana*, Fulcher of Chartes. Hagenmeyer, ed. Heidelberg 748-9 (III. 37).
- Harke, Heinrich. 1991. All Quiet on the Western Front? Paradigms, methods and approaches in West German Archaeology. In *Archaeological theory in Europe: the last three decades*, ed. Ian Hodder. Routledge, London. Pp.187-222.
- Harke, Heinrich. 1995. "The Hun is a methodical chap": Reflections on the German tradition of pre- and protohistory. In *Theory in Archaeology: A world perspective*. Ed. Peter J. Ucko, Theoretical Archaeology Group Series. Routledge, London. Pp 46-60.
- Harke, Heinrich. 2000. Social Analysis of Mortuary Evidence in German Protohistoric Archaeology. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 19:369-384.
- Helmuth, H. 1970. Zur Paläodemographie der Völkerwanderungszeitlichen Skelettsreihe von Altenerding bei München. *Homo* 21:85-88
- Helmuth, H. 1977. Körperhöhe, Paläodemographie und Selektion bei der frühmittelalterlichen Skelettsreihe von Altenerding. *Festschrift 75 Jahre Anthropologische Staatssammlung, München 1977*:125-142.
- Helmuth, H. n.d. Anthropologische Untersuchungen an den menschlichen Skeletten von Altenerding. Ms. On file, Peterborough: Department of Anthropology, Trent University.

- Hubert, Jean. 1969. Europe of the invasions. J. Hubert, J. Porcher, W.F. Volbach ; [translated by Stuart Gilbert and James Emmons]. New York : G. Braziller.
- Jones, Sian. 1997. The archaeology of ethnicity : constructing identities in the past and present. New York : Routledge.
- Jons, Hauke, Friedrich Luth, and Michael Muller-Wille. 1994. Ausgrabungen auf dem fruhgeschichtlichen Seehandelsplatz von Grob Stromkendorf. Kr. Nordwestmecklenburg. Erste Ergebnisse eines Forschungsprojektes. *Germania* 75:193-221.
- Keller, Erwin. 1985. Das Schicksal der einheimischen Bevölkerung und das Fortleben keltischer Traditionen. *In: Die Römer in Schwaben*, p. 28-29.
- Kersting, Thomas. 1992. Ein sippenweise belgtes alamannisches Graberfeld von Zusamaltheim, Kr. Dillingen a.d. Donau. *Archaeologisches Korrespondenzblatt* 22:255-265.
- Koch, Ursula. 1990. Das frankische Graberfeld von Klepsau im Hohenlohkreis. Forschungen und Berichte zur Vor- und Frugeschichte in Baden-Wurttemberg 38. Theiss, Stuttgart.
- Musty, J. and Stratton, J.E.D. 1964. A Saxon Cemetery at Winterbourne Gunner, Near Salisbury. *Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine* 59, 86-109.
- Randers-Peherson, Justine Davis. 1983. Barbarians and Romans: The Birth Struggle of Europe, AD 400-700. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Reynolds, Susan. 1998. Our Forefathers? Tribes, Peoples, and Nations in the Historiography of the Age of Migrations. *In: After Rome's Fall: narrators and sources of early mediaeval history*. Alexander Murray, ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. pp. 17-36.
- Rieder, Karl Heinz. 1995. *Archaeology um Ingolstadt*. Kipfenberg. p. 211-217.
- Sage, W. 1970. Zur germanischen Landnahme in Altbayern. *Probleme der Zeit*:41-46.
- Sage, W. 1975. Das Reihengräberfeld von Altenerding. Sonderdruck aus *Ausgrabungen in Deutschland*. Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums 1:254-277.
- Sage, W. 1984. Das Reihengräberfeld von Altenerding in Oberbayern I. *GermanischeDenkmaler der Volkerwanderungszeit*. Vol 14. Gebr. Mann Verlag, Berlin.
- Scorpan, C. 1980. *Limes Scythiae*. BAR International Series.
- Shennen, S.J. 1989. Archaeological approaches to cultural identity. London ; Boston : Unwin Hyman.
- Siegmund, Frank. 1999. Als Franke sterben: Ethnizität und Lebensraum der sudlichen Nachbarn der Sachsen

- archaeologischen Quellen.
*Studien zur
Sachsenforschung*
12:209-222.
- Siegmund, Frank. 2000. *Alemannen und Franken*. Archaeologische Studie zu Ethnien und ihren Siedlungsraumen in der Merowingerzeit. Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 23. Der Gruyter, Berlin and New York.
- Smith, Anthony D. 1986. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Oxford Press.
- Stubbs, W. 1969. *Germany in the Early Middle Ages 476-1250*. Edited by A. Hassall. Howard Fertig, New York.
- Steuer, Heiko. 1984. Zur ethnischen Gliederung der Bevölkerung von Haithabu anhand der Graberfelder. *Offa* 41:189-212.
- Wade, Peter. 1997. *Race and Ethnicity in Latin America*. Series: Critical Studies of Latin America. London: Pluto Press.
- Wells, C.M. 1972. *The German Policy of Augustus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.